

REMARKS

This document is filed in reply to the Advisory Action dated October 7, 2009 (“Advisory Action”) and the Final Office Action dated July 21, 2009 (“Final Office Action”)

We have amended independent claims 6, 13, 20 and 26 to recite that bores of the through-connections are filled with a medium in the form of a lacquer, wherein the lacquer is at least partly accomplished by means of screen printing. Support for these amendments can be found at paragraphs [0032] and [0039] of the originally-filed application. We have also canceled claims 20-24.

Prior Art Rejections

We submit that neither Hirose (US 6,407,345) nor Stopperan (US 5,719,749), separately or in any proper combination, disclose the inventions recited in independent claims 6, 20 and 26 as amended. Specifically, neither reference discloses filling of the bores of the through-connections with a medium in the form of a lacquer, wherein the lacquer is at least partly accomplished by means of screen printing, as recited in these independent claims. Among other advantages, by using a screen-printing method for filling the bores, a standard medium or standard plugging paste can be used and reduces the cost of the manufacturing process.

Hirose fills his bores with a special medium, which has to be finished by a complex treatment of polishing by a belt sander using belt abrasive paper (see Hirose, column 15, lines 29 to 37). Hirose also discloses that the upper side and the bottom side of his printed circuit board are smudged with the plugging paste after filling the bores. Thus, the lower side and the upper side have to be smoothed after drying of the plugging paste. This smoothening process is only possible before the creation of the conductive pattern, since the conductive pattern would be otherwise destroyed by the smoothening process. Applicant’s invention does not require the cleaning of the surface sides, since the conductive pattern has already been created before filling the bores.

We further submit that because claims 7-10 and 12 depend from independent claim 6 and claims 14-17 and 19 depend from independent claim 13, these dependent claims are allowable for at least the same reasons that claims 6 and 13 are allowable.

Conclusion

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

The Petition for Extension of Time fee in the amount of \$490.00 is being paid concurrently herewith on the Electronic Filing System (EFS) by way of Deposit Account authorization. Please apply any other charges or credits to Deposit Account No. 50-4189, referencing Attorney Docket No. 3A001-010001.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: Dec. 21, 2009

Van Robin Rohlicek REG. 43,349

Frank R. Occhiuti
Reg. No. 35,306

Customer No. 69713
Occhiuti Rohlicek & Tsao LLP
10 Fawcett Street
Cambridge, MA 02138
Telephone: (617) 500-2501
Facsimile: (617) 500-2499
119382.doc